DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 215 CG 020 905

AUTHOR Kuehne, Valerie Shahariw
TITLE "Younger Friends/Older Friends:" An Intergenerational Culture.
PUB DATE Mar 88
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society on Aging (34th, San Diego, CA, March 18-22, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Day Care; Friendship; *Group Behavior; *Group Dynamics; *Intergenerational Programs; *Older Adults; *Preschool Children; Preschool Education

ABSTRACT

This study examined the behaviors of intergenerational group members of an intergenerational program involving seven adult day care clients and seven preschool day care children. Coordinators of the program include a recreational therapist from the adult center and the children's teacher. The 14 "friends" met once a week for an hour. In this study, nine of the group sessions were observed. Findings revealed that the interactions between adults and children were overwhelmingly positive. Interview data supported observations regarding the positive ways in which seven of the group members viewed the group. Printed materials from the organization suggested that "caring" and "life enrichment" were among its priorities. Program coordinators built on the group members' feelings of solidarity by encouraging them, through applause and cheering, and by directing each meeting to minimize conflict and confusion. Two enthusiastic adult group members assisted the coordinators. To the extent that interactions between older adults and young children in society resemble those found in this study, the results may be even more generalizable. (ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED296215

"YOUNGER FRIENDS/OLDER FRIENDS:" AN INTERGENERATIONAL CULTURE

CG 020905

Valerie Shahariw Kuehne

Northwestern University

Human Development and Social Policy Program

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

March, 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Valerie Shahariw Kuehne

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INTRODUCTION TO THE CULTURE

The site for this study is an Adult Day Care facility in suburban Chicago. Based in a church building, this program identifies, as its target group, families "whose disabled older members do not require the full-time services of a nursing home and, at the same time, offers these families vital respite from the pressures and demands of caring for the disabled elderly relative who lives with them" (printed materials). Adults attending this program participate in supervised activities including baking and cooking, crafts, discussion groups, sewing classes, art therapy, ceramics, horticultural therapy in a greenhouse, and an intergenerational program involving children. Field trips for participants include travels to museums, shopping facilities, nature walks, movies, picnics, and other supervised recreational activities.

The physical setting includes a number of rooms, large and small, in which the activities take place. One of two very large rooms, known as the "Carpet Room" contains many large, padded chairs. It is here that participants, known as "clients," drink coffee each morning before beginning their day's agenda. The other very large room is not carpeted, and contains approximately eight banquet-style tables with eight chairs per table. Lining the walls are various pictures and other art projects completed by clients. Two walls are windowed, and plants adorn the window sills. Other, smaller rooms, including the kitchen, offices, ceramics, sewing, and music rooms, are located throughout the two-story building.

Program staff include a director, rehabilitation counselor, nurse, cook, nutritionist, and various art, recreation, and activity therapists or counselors. A number of student nurses and interns from a variety of

educational institutions around the metropolitan area are also found participating or observing in each day's activities.

Clients choose the program(s) they wish to attend. In some cases, however, program staff select certain clients to be involved. Such is the case in the intergenerational program, the specific program observed for this study.

Based on the theme of "Older Friends: Younger Friends," this intergenerational program involves seven adult day care clients, and seven preschool, day care children. The program's coordinators include one recreational therapist from the adult center, and the children's teacher. These fourteen "friends" meet once weekly, for approximately one hour, in the dining room at the adult center. Each week, 16 chairs are arranged in a circle in one corner of the room, and an activity or project is planned, often using four of the large tables set up in another part of the room.

PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

The purpose of this research was to study the behaviors of intergenerational group members. This paper presents the findings and related discussion after nine weeks of observation.

METHOD

This study began in the program's third week. The researcher was allowed to attend the group sessions weekly, to observe the interactions, and to participate as desired. Nine group sessions were observed in total. To maintain confidentiality, participant's names used are pseudonyms.

THEORETICAL RATIONALE

This investigation relates to three major bodies of sociological research: the maintenance of group solidarity, the replication of societal patterns in small groups, and the legitimation of authority. Each of these three areas addresses a different aspect of group association.

Pitts (1961) describes Durkheim's views regarding the source of society's constraining force:

> the sharing by individuals of a common set of representations, which prescribe and proscribe certain types of behavior, and which, because they are shared, create solidarity among those who share them -- create, that is, a desire to be mutually helpful and to avoid conflict. (p. 686)

The group of adults and children studied may be seen as a small "society;" one in which the researcher hypothesizes, certain behaviors may be more prescribed than others; representations supporting these behaviors help to create solidarity and minimize conflict among group members.

Hare, Borgatta and Bales (1955) suggest that the study of small groups can reveal many resemblances to "larger-scale social systems" (Preface). The group observed, involving older adults and preschool children, may reflect behaviors, interactions, or relationships that correspond to those found in society more generally.

Regarding the legitimation of authority, Pitts (1961) describes some of Max Weber's views on society:

> society exists where there is an authority that, in a sense, precedes it. And this authority is attached to ideas that

fulfill the individual's needs for ultimate meaning. In return for this fulfillment, the individual grants legitimate authority to a leader or to a ruling apparatus. (pp. 686-7)

I hypothesize that members of the small, intergenerational group may grant authority to those in charge of the program, and that this authority is granted in return for benefits received by the group members. For without those in authority positions, the group would not exist at all. This hypothesis is based on the assumption that group members experience fulfillment from group membership. One might expect that such a fulfilling experience involving others would be characterized by primarily positive interactions.

FINDINGS

Observation Findings

Positive Interactions. The primarily positive interactions noted between the older adults and children were striking. Positive interactions included a number of categories in the Taxonomy of Positive Interactions seen in Figure 1.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Table 1 provides frequencies of interactions in each category. The

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

first category, helping interactions, included situations in which one

group member, usually the older adult, assisted another group member, usually the child. In most cases, the assisted member was attempting something individually, when the assisting member intervened. The following anecdote illustrates this category:

> Barry is attempting to put his sweater on, but his arms do not go all the way through the sleeves.
>
> Harry: Let me help you with your sweater.
>
> Barry: Okay.
>
> Harry pulls the sleeves right-side-out, and helps him put it on. (D7)

In many of the helping situations, like the one above, the word "help" actually appeared in the interaction. Helping comments were especially frequent during project completion. Coordinators would also ask the adults to help the children, on occasion. For example, the following request occurred before the group was to begin an art project:

> Marcy (Coordinator): Your names are on the papers -- would the older friends help the younger ones find their names? (B3)

The second category of positive interactions included more direct, instructing comments. Here, one group member would seemingly "teach" another something, most often a child, as in the following:

> The children are gathering their things (in order to leave). I notice that Mary has Barry's attention at a corner of the room where a large quilt is on a stretching frame. She is pointing to the quilt stretched, and they have a conversation.
>
> Barry: I sure like that.
>
> Mary: We're not finished sewing it yet. See there is nothing

there? (She points to a part of the quilt that is not stitched yet). It looks different when it's done like this (She points to the part that is stitched, and looks at Barry and smiles). (E9)

Another category of positive interaction included interactions in which two group members agreed. Twelve of these interactions were recorded. The following includes agreement, and demonstrates how short most of the interactions in this category are as well:

Sandy and Harry are seated across from each other at the table.

Sandy: Harry, we're sitting across from each other again.

Harry: Right you are!

Both smile. (J4)

There were 130 examples of giving affection in the nine sessions observed. The frequency of this category of positive interactions was influenced by the fact that a group ritual including hugging of group members occurred at the end of each meeting. The procedure for concluding sessions included two songs: one emphasizing love, and the other emphasizing the group's regular meeting (the next week). Immediately following the singing of these two songs, hugs were recommended by the coordinator(s), which the children were expected to initiate. The following anecdote illustrates this concluding procedure:

Patty (Coordinator): Well, it's time to sing. Let's sing our Good Bye song.

ALL SING: I have some love for you.
Yours to share your whole life through.
I have some love for you,
Do you have some love for me?

Good bye, good bye, we'll see you again next Tuesday,

Good bye, good bye, we'll see you again next Tuesday.

Patty: Okay, time for hugs and coats.

Sandy runs to Mary and gives her a big hug. Three other girls join Sandy and Mary. Mary reaches her arms around them all.

Mary: Beautiful. (She is smiling).

June and Janet go to Fran.

Fran: I love you. (She kisses and hugs them both).

Two girls go to Sammy.

Sammy hugs them together, and kisses them both on the forehead.

Abe goes to Elly, and hugs her very hard, and her wheelchair moves backward slightly. She smiles.

Abe then goes to Sammy, and then to Fran, smiling and hugging each of them. (H8,9)

There were 73 examples of one group member complimenting another, for various reasons. In all but two cases, it was an older adult who complimented a child, as in the following situation:

There are 5 adults and 5 children in the circle area; the adults are sitting on the chairs, and the children are in the center of the circle. There are 4 girls in the circle.

Nancy: I can do this. (She turns around several times, and puts her hands above her head in a circle, like a ballerina).

Julia: My turn. (She repeats the action, but stumbles with her feet as she turns around).

Harry: Terrific. (He applauds the first two girls, smiling).

Sandy: My turn, too. (She repeats the same motion).

Janet: I can do it too. (She does it as well, but stumbles, and does not do a complete circle around).

Harry: Lovely. All of you. (D5,6)

Another positive interaction type included joking or playing behaviors. In all but two of these interactions involved the same two adult group members, Harry and Mary. Many times the play was restricted to a dyad composed of an older and younger participant, as below:

Harry and Sandy, who are seated across from one another, and will be partners on their picture, both have paint brushes in their hands, and are hitting them against one another, in a manner of a sword fight, both laughing. (D3)

In four situations, the play expanded into a group activity, as below:

Barry (who sits next to Harry) begins to snort (like a pig), and Harry smiles at him. Then Harry begins to do the same. And slowly, 2 more children begin. The conversation has stopped, and then all the children are laughing and making snorting sounds. (B6)

Encouraging interactions also occurred between group members. In 39 of the 44 occurrences, an older adult would encourage a child in a project, as below:

Mary: Now you can do all this (pointing, with her paint brush, to a part of the large, unpainted leaf. Janet begins to paint the area shown). See, that is perfect.

(Janet continues to paint.) (D4)

There were 21 examples of silent cooperation: situations in which dyads (one older and one younger group member) would work together, but no words would be spoken. This form of cooperation was visible in each group session where a project was completed, and included all group members, at one time or another. The following anecdote illustrates:

> Chester and Stanley (his younger friend) have been painting in silence throughout this activity. They have been sitting across from one another, and I have glanced at them occasionally throughout the hour. During this observation of them, Stanley looks up at Chester, and Chester looks back at him; they both smile. The boy then continues painting. (D5)

A final category of positive interactions includes those that contributed as much or more to group solidarity as affirming individual group members. Such interactions were noted during collective activities, always when members were seated together as a group. The following excerpt of a very long interaction illustrates this point:

> Patty (Coordinator): Okay, we're almost all sitting down now. I'd like us to have an art show. Everybody worked so hard on their pictures. (She holds up each of the pictures one by one. I record, as best I can, the responses from the group as each picture is held up. The adults are the only ones to speak. The children are silent during this, but are watching each picture as it is held up.)
>
> Patty: Here's Leslie's picture.
>
> Harry: Terrific.
>
> Mary: Pretty.
>
> Patty: Fran's picture.

Harry: That's different.

Elly: Oh yes.

Patty: Billy's picture.

Harry: Billy's good.

Patty: Elly's picture.

Harry: That's terrific.

Irene: That's a nice one.

Mary: Yes, terrific.

Patty: Here's Stanley's picture.

Mary: Like red clouds! That's lovely.

Patty: And Barry's picture.

Barry: That's mine!

Patty: Harry's picture.

Fran: Great.

Patty: Sandy's picture.

Mary: Good.

Sammy nods.

Patty: Oops, I had it upside down (and reverses it). Irene's picture.

Irene: Oh, who put my name on it? (Laughing. The other adults laugh also)... [*The interaction continues in the same pattern until all the pictures have been shown.] (G11)

The following anecdote demonstrates the group's response to a new member, substituting for an ill child. This anecdote illustrates the group's expressed solidarity during its eighth meeting:

Patty (Coordinator) sits down in the circle, and says a few words to Marcy (Coordinator), who is sitting next to her today. I cannot hear their conversation, but suddenly Patty

announces to the group: I would like to introduce a new friend today. This is Billy. (She points across the room to the boy sitting beside Harry). Hold up your hand Billy. Billy holds up both hands, and smiles. Mary claps her hands and cheers, "Yay." Elly says, "Hello Friend," and claps on the side of her wheelchair with her able hand. Several of the children clap their hands and cheer, "Yay." Billy smiles. (G5)

Negative Interactions. The two categories of negative interactions are listed in Figure 2, along with the other behavior categories noted.

Insert Figure 2 about here

As Table 2 indicates, the number of negative interactions were far fewer

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

than positive ones. Specifically, while there were nine categories of positive interactions and 462 interactions recorded in all, there were only two categories, and fourteen instances of negative interactions recorded during the nine group observations made.

The first type of negative interaction was aggressive behavior. In all but two cases, the children demonstrated this behavior, as in the situation below:

Harry: You dropped your glass. (Abe has knocked his plastic cup from the table to the floor).

Abe: I know.

Harry: (Begins singing, "You are my sunshine.")

Stanley: We're not singing. (His brow is furrowed).

Harry: Oh. Can we talk?

Stanley: Yes, but not sing. (J5)

The second type of negative interaction was termed, rejection. Examples of this behavior were related exclusively to giving and receiving affection. The following interaction illustrates:

[It is the end of a meeting, and the children and adults are hugging.] Elly, who is in a wheelchair, says, "I need a hug." No one responds. She repeats the statement, and still no one responds. She looks on as the rest are involved in the hugging. (D7)

Ignored Comments. There were 16 of comments between adult and child participants that were ignored, but not related to giving or receiving affection, as were the rejecting comments referred to above. When coded, the ignored comments did not appear to contain any common themes, nor did they involve the same group members repeatedly. One comment was made by a child to an adult participant who is particularly hard of hearing. The comment was either ignored, or not heard. Another comment was directed to an adult who talked very little at all throughout the nine sessions observed. It was made by a child during a period of silent cooperation already excerpted here. The anecdote appears below in its entirety:

Chester and Stanley (his younger friend) have been painting in silence throughout this activity. They have been sitting across from one another, and I have glanced at them occasionally throughout the hour. During this observation of them, the boy looks up at Chester, and Chester looks back at him; they both smile. The boy then continues painting.

Stanley: Are you done over there? (He points to a part of the picture that is closest to Chester.)

Chester does not respond. He continues painting. The boy goes back to painting, too. (D5)

Collusion. After several observations, 24 behaviors representing collusion were noted between group members. Goffman (1971) describes a "collusive alignment" or collusion, as "a coalition aimed at one kind of control -- the third party's definition of the situation" (p. 338). He also views collusion as important to small group functioning:

> ...it is probably impossible for interaction to continue among three persons for any length of time without collusion occurring, for the tacit betrayal of the third person is one of the main ways in which two persons express the specialness of their own relation to each other. Stable triads seem always to involve at least a little round-robin collusion... (p. 339-340).

Three different types of collusion were noted: those between the two coordinators; between adult group members; and between coordinator(s) and adult group members. There were seven instances in which collusion between coordinators took place. In four of the seven cases, the two coordinators were smiling and/or laughing in agreement over the group's (or a group member's) behavior. The following anecdote illustrates this behavior:

Patty (Coordinator): Who's glad the rain is gone?

Group: Yay!

Patty: Look at the hands on the wall [some previous artwork done by the group]. And at our rainbow [also some previous artwork]. How many of you have noticed the leaves are getting

different colors?

Sandy: At my house they're red.

Abe: They're only green at my house.

There follows a sudden explosion of almost every child describing the leaves and theire colors at their homes -- I am not able to get each word down. While each of the children is talking, the adults are looking at the children sitting immediately beside them. The teachers look at one another, and smile. (B3)

Collusion between adult group members was seen 14 times in all the observations. As in the collusion seen between coordinators, in many cases, adults smiled as they colluded about the children's behaviors. Two adults, Harry and Mary, were responsible for much of this collusion, but in the anecdote below, other adult group members join in:

[The children are beginning to leave.]

Mary: Bye all.

Harry: Good bye. See 'ya.

Mary: They're so adoreable and smart.

Harry: They are so cute. They are so cute.

Elly: They're great, and fun.

Harry nods his head.

Mary (to Sammy): Very good. So cute. So beautiful.

Sammy nods in agreement.

The last four children leave the room. (I8)

In this situation, the collusion may also have served to reaffirm the group, and build solidarity among its members. The third type of collusion was seen between adult group members and the coordinator(s).

All three of the comments in this category were about the children, as the one below illustrates:

> Fran (an adult group member), who has been looking at the children eating cookies, says to Mary (Coordinator), while pointing to Stanley: "He was shy. Yes, he's getting much better now." Then she looks at Patty (Coordinator), and Patty responds, "Yes, and he looks forward to coming, too." (E8)

Coordinators' Roles. There were three related categories of coordinators' behaviors observed repeatedly throughout the sessions, as seen in Table 3. Their behaviors were recorded to determine the extent

---

Insert Table 3 about here

---

to which they acted as authority figures, or leaders of the intergenerational group, as might be the case in a Weberian society (Pitts, 1961).

First, the two coordinators directed the group's agenda at each meeting, indicating what group members should do when, and often times, how (especially where art projects were concerned). Beyond such direction, the coordinators also encouraged group members as they completed the agenda, whether through activities or discussion. Examples of the 181 recorded comments in this category appear in the two anecdotes below:

> Patty (Coordinator): Well, that's great. And now we're almost up to more holidays. Christmas and Hanukkah are coming, where we give gifts to others. Today, I thought we should concentrate on making ourselves a present. So, we're going to make salt jars. (J4)

Patty (Coordinator): Harry, your picture is really nice. I like the way it turned out.

Harry: I watched Stanley do his. And I did the same, I sort of copied how he did it.

Patty: It's good.

Stanley: But mine didn't have mushroom marks.

Patty: That's okay Stanley. (G10)

The second category of coordinators' roles includes various controlling, or authoritative behaviors. These behaviors were displayed solely by one coordinator, Patty, the children's teacher. Similarly, the authoritative interactions involved only children, rather than adults, as the following excerpt illustrates:

Natalie: Patty, I want to sit with you.

Patty: No, I think you should sit right there (pointing to an empty chair beside Mary). (B2)

On one occasion a coordinator asked an adult group member to help control the children's behavior. This was the first and only time such a "transference" of authority, or leadership, occurred through all the interactions. The adult involved handled the situation as follows:

Marcy (Coordinator): Sammy, you go sit with the kids if you're done. Try to keep them in line, too?

Sammy and Marcy both smile. The children are in the circle, chasing one another, and laughing loudly. Sammy goes to the circle, and chases Abe and Sandy around the circle, ending up at their respective chairs. He chases June to her chair as well, both of them laughing. (H8)

The final category of coordinators' behaviors included group

solidarity-building techniques. On 24 occasions, especially Patty, would lead the group in applause or cheers following singing, or an activity. The following anecdote illustrates:

> The children sing the second verse [of a song] very quietly, and Patty says: "And now real loud" -- and the entire group, both children and adults, sing the first verse very loudly, the children almost screaming. Chester bursts out laughing.
>
> Mary: Terrific (when they're done).
>
> Patty: Yay! (Clapping) Everyone is smiling, and several are clapping. (J2)

As this anecdote reveals, these solidarity-building techniques were not directed toward any particular group member as much as they referred to the group as a whole.

Overall, the coordinators' roles represented primarily leadership and the use of authority: to direct the program's activities, to control primarily children's behaviors, and to build group solidarity.

Welcoming Ritual. A final category of observed group behavior involved only the adult group members, and it was begun each week as the children could be heard walking up the steps to the meeting room. Two adult members, Harry and Mary, were the most involved in the welcoming ritual. The anecdotes included here illustrates:

> Mary: There they are, and they're darling.
>
> Harry waves to the children, and smiles broadly.
>
> Mary: Hi, sweethearts.
>
> Harry: Hi, everybody. (B2)

> Harry: There they are. Come on in (waving his right hand in a circle toward him).

Mary: We're so glad to have you. (D1)

By the time all nine sessions were coded, however, all adult members, except Sammy, were involved in one or more of these welcoming rituals.

DISCUSSION

The findings reveal interactions that are overwhelmingly positive. Interview data support observations regarding the positive ways in which seven of the group members view the group. And printed materials from the hosting organization suggest that "caring," and "life enrichment" are among its priorities. What still remains unclear, at first glance, is why this group succeeds.

Daniels (1971) found that in a sensitivity training group, "the process of scapegoating contributed to the stability of the group and to the reaffirmation of more general values of the institution that sponsored it" (p. 235). Clearly, there are other ways to develop stability. The group in this study appeared stable, with few negative interactions and minimal conflict. The sensitivity group, while perhaps as artificial as the intergenerational group, addressed more personal, and thus threatening, issues than did the intergenerational one. More specifically, the sensitivity group's time could be used for any purpose decided upon by group members: "they could ventilate grievances, practice group therapy techniques, or study communication processes" (p. 235). But the intergenerational group was much more superficial, concentrating on national holidays, seasons of the year, and other subjects that were much less personal. In this way, less was expected of the intergenerational group members, and rewards were given more easily and generously.

Group members' involvement during the intergenerational groups' discussions included recalling personal experiences on occasion, but those who chose not to participate in the group verbally were not ostracized, excluded from future group activities, nor did they threaten the group's stability. For example, Chester, an adult group member, spoke on only five occasions during one group meeting. The rest of his contributions to the group included silent cooperation (excerpted earlier), and smiles in response to others' statements. Even with Chester's primarily nonverbal contributions to the group, he continued to be acknowledged and involved by coordinators and other group members, including children, during discussions and activities.

Durkheim's notion of society presented at this paper's outset provides some rationale for the intergenerational group's functioning. This researcher believes that the primarily positive behaviors observed in this group serve to create solidarity among group members, and constitute its "prescribed" behaviors (Pitts, 1961). The preponderance of positive interactions has become a major part of the group's norms. Affection, at least the hugging, has even occurred, in more recent observations, at times other than those designated in the concluding moments of each meeting. There are few negative or even ignored comments, and they do not appear to threaten the group's social order.

Program coordinators build on the group members' feelings of solidarity by encouraging them, through applause and cheering, and by directing each meeting to minimize conflict and confusion. They are assisted in their role by two of the adult group members, Harry and Mary. These two participants are by far the most enthusiastic adult communicators, repeatedly emphasizing the positive group norms in their behaviors, and so their role in maintaining the group's social order

cannot be underestimated. In addition, Harry and Mary were the most responsible for another solidarity-building activity, the welcoming ritual. By the end of the observed sessions, they were even leading others in this behavior.

If one looks at the intergenerational group as a triad: the adults, the children, and the coordinators each as one group "member," then Goffman's statements regarding collusion in small groups are useful in explaining this group's stable functioning. Specifically, the adults in the intergenerational group, whether participants or coordinators, were the primary colluders, indicating that the adults did not see the intergenerational group as one made up of equals.

Pitts (1961) suggests that Max Weber viewed society as made up of individuals who grant authority to others in return for fulfillment. In the intergenerational group, the adults and children meet each week, only through the permission and planning of the coordinators; and the coordinators take total charge of each group meeting. In return, the group brings its members a positive experience, as is evident from the affectionate and positive interactions observed week by week, and from the interview data.

While several examples of authoritative or controlling behaviors were exhibited by the coordinators, especially Patty, during the nine group meetings observed, on only one occasion was an adult group member asked to help "control" several children's behaviors. The adult was able to accomplish the task masterfully by playing a game with the children, rather than appearing to the children as colluding with the authority figures, or becoming one himself. It is difficult, since the adult involved was not interviewed, to explain his behavior in the situation. However, Ramirez Barranti (1985) reviewed the literature on

grandparenting styles within families, to discover that a non-authoritative role including "pleasure without responsibility" is common in studies of our society. Apple (1956), in an ethnographic study of 75 societies, found that grandparents were commonly disassociated from family authority. Such findings help to support a final point. Hare et al. (1955) maintain that small groups can bear resemblances to larger social systems. This would seem to be true, at least as demonstrated by the adult group members' lack of authoritative involvement in this intergenerational group's functioning. To the extent that interactions between older adults and young children in society resemble those found in this study, the results obtained may be even more generalizable.

APPLIED SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS STUDY

Organized, extra-familial, intergenerational programs are a relatively recent phenomenon. They began in the 1970's, and since then, many programs linking the old and the young have begun nation-wide (Tice, 1985). Their purpose is generally to expose often age-segregated children and older adults to one another, encouraging one group to acknowledge and benefit from the strengths of the other. While programs and activities vary widely, organized intergenerational initiatives can now be found in all 50 states. Indeed, a number of policy makers and others make clear their mandate for additional federal support of intergenerational programs that serve a variety of purposes (Brahce, 1980; Leahy, 1985; Roybal, 1985). This study offers an indepth view of one such program that lives up to its stated aims. The value of such programs, based on this research, is that they can be social situations in which primarily positive experiences are shared by members of two distinct age groups.

References

Apple, D. (1956). The social structure of grandparenthood. American Anthropologist, 58, 656-663.

Brahce, C. (1980). Intergenerational Linkage: An Emerging Field for Policy Formulation and Funding. Grants Magazine, 3(3), 169-176.

Daniels, Arlene Kaplan. (1970). Development of the scapegoat in sensitivity training sessions. In T. Shibutani (Ed.), Human nature and collective behavior. New York: Prentice Hall.

Goffman, E. (1971). Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order. New York: Basic Books.

Hare, A.P., Borgatta, E., & Bales, R. (Eds.) (1955). Small groups: Studies in social interaction. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Leahy, P. (1985). Commentary. In K. Struntz & S. Reville (Eds.), Growing Together: An Intergenerational Sourcebook, (p. 7), Washington, DC: American Association of Retired Persons.

Pitts, J. (1961). Introduction: Personality and the social system. In T. Parsons, E. Shils, K. Naegele, and J. Pitts (Eds.), Theories of society: Foundations of modern sociological theory, Vols. I and II. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc.

Ramirez Barranti, C. (1985). The grandparent/grandchild relationship: Family resource in an era of voluntary bonds. Family Relations, 34, 343-352.

Roybal, E. (1985). Commentary. In K. Struntz & S. Reville (Eds.), Growing Together: An Intergenerational Sourcebook, (pp. 7-8)/ Washington, DC; American Association of Retired Persons.

Tice, C. (1985). Perspectives on intergenerational initiatives: Past, present and future. Children Today, 14(5), 6-10.

FIGURE 1

TAXONOMY OF POSITIVE INTERACTIONS

Helping

Instructing

Agreeing

Giving Affection

Complimenting

Playing

Encouraging

Silently Cooperating

Building Group Solidarity

TABLE 1

Taxonomy of Positive Interactions

Category	Frequency	Percent
Helping	33	7.1
Instructing	35	7.6
Agreeing	12	2.6
Giving Affection	130	28.1
Complimenting	73	15.8
Playing	70	15.2
Encouraging	44	9.5
Silently Cooperating	21	4.5
Building Group Solidarity	44	9.5
Total Positive Interactions	462	100.0

FIGURE 2

TAXONOMY OF NEGATIVE INTERACTIONS

Aggression

Rejection

OTHER INTERACTIONS OBSERVED

Ignored Comments

Collusion
- Between Adult Group Members
- Between Adult Group Members and Coordinators
- Between Coordinators

Welcoming Ritual

TABLE 2

Taxonomy of Negative Interactions

Categories	Frequency	Percent
Aggression	11	78.6
Rejection	3	21.4
Total Negative Interactions	14	100.0

TABLE 3

COORDINATORS' ROLES

Category	Frequency	Percent
Direction/ Encouragement	181	84.6
Control/ Authority	9	4.2
Group Solidarity Building	24	11.2
Total Interactions	214	100.0